and do it so that every one can understand it. He hoped

ld be left upon which to rebuild it bereafter. Ir. PUGH remarked that this \$150 to each would operate very unequally on those coming from dif-ferent States; and he did not know but that some senaters might take the stamps and not send the documents.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr.

Mason, to strike out the second section, it was agreed to—

cas 51, nays none as follows: 5 FAS Messys. Allen, Bayard, Bell, Benjaron, Cameron, Chandler, Cheenut, Clark, C. 18 A. Moore, Allen, Rayara, 1881, Tenguary, Chugunau, Collamor Crittenden, Davis, Doolitife, Burkee, Fos coden, Fach, Frigatrick Fool, Foster, Gwin, Hale, Hammond, Harkan, Huntson, Hunter, Johnson of Tennessee, Jones, King, Lane, Malfory, Maron, Pearce, Polit Pugli, Beld, Hue, Sward, Suldell, Smith, Sbaart Toombe, Trumbull, Wade, Wilson, and Yulce—31.

Mr. DAVIS moved to strike out the first five section

ent, and jusert in lieu thereof the fol

scept so far as it has been conferred by Co go, be, and the same is hereby, abolished." After a long debate, the question being taken, the

ent was not agreed to-yeas 18, nays 26-as YEAS Mesers Brown, Chesnut, Clingman, Davis, Donglas,

Fitspatrick, Gwin, Iverson, Johnson of Arkanasa, Johnson of nessee, Jones, Lane, Maffory, Pearce, Polk, Reid, and Sebartian-NAYE-Moors, Alon, Benjamio, Brederick, Cark, Cay, Colla Rixon, Boolittle, Fessenden, Foster, Green, Hale, Hamin, Hou Henter, Pigh, Rice, Sevarde, Shiedle, Simmons, Stuart, Too Wate, Ward, and Wilson—20.

Wade, Ward, and Wilson—20.

Mr. HALE opposed any increase in the rates of postage. The work of retrenchment ought to be commenced anywhere else rather than by taxing the people an additional sum for their letters. He thought there might be a great saving in the letting of contracts, and he also advocated the repeal of the law making all railroads post routes. He believed if the postage was raised, the revenues of the department would be diminished in consequence of the large amount of mail matter that would be conveyed by express companies, and otherwise, outside of the mail. Mr. H. moved to strike out that section of the committee's menument which increases the letter postage.

amendment which increases the letter postage.
r. DIXON argued that a high rate of postage dimin ishes the gross revenues of the department, and as the rates of postage are diminished the revenue increases. He cited statistics in support of this proposition. Mr. SIMMONS said that letter postages paid for letter

Mr. SIMMONS said that letter postages paid for letter transportation already, and more too; and if it was de-sired to make the Post Office Department self-sustaining, the charges ought to be put on that description of mai matter which does not pay for itself. The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. Hall

agreed to-yeas 19, nays 27-as follows :

YEAS Mesers Bigler, Cameron, Chandier, Clark, Collamer, Dixon Douglas, Burkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Hale, Hamilin, Harlan, King, Simmonn, Suart, Trambull, and Wilson—19.

NAYS—Mesers, Allen, Benjamin, Broderick, Brown, Clay, Clingman, Davis, Fitch, Fitzpatrick, Green, Houston, Honter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkansas, Johnson of Temessee, Jones, Lane, Malfory Pearser, Folk, Reid, Rice, Schastian, Siddell, Smith, Ward, and Yuleo.—27.

On the above vote, it was approunced that Messrs

SHIELDS and TOOMS, had severally paired off.

Mr. COLLAMER moved to amend the bill by inserting a clause repealing so much of the acts of March 3, 1847, and of March 3, 1851, as makes an annual appropriation to defray the expenses of the franking privilege: which was agreed to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved to strike out the seventh

section of the amendment of the committee, which pro-hibits the Postmaster General from making contracts for the transportation of the mail with any view to the trans-portation of passengers, and restricts him in making such contracts to the acceptance of such bids only as shall pro-

contracts to the acceptance of such bids only as shall provide for the conveyance of the mails.

Mr. WHEON spoke in opposition to the motion. He said that the people of the North and East, who paid their own postage, had not only to pay the postages of other sections, but had also to pay for running coaches for their accommodation. These mail routes had been established for the promotion of other and outside interests.

Mr. BRODERICK said he had voted to raise the postage to five cents because Californians had to pay ten cents for their letters, and it was not fair that other sections should have to pay only three cents.

should have to pay only three cents.

Mr. FITZPATRICK contended that it was not the coach

ervice, but the railroad service, which was so expensive

the department.

Mr. SMITH said that Massachusetts had been asking rich, she complains that she has to pay more than her fair proportion for postal facilities. He contended that the people of New England and the scaboard cities were benefited by their intercourse with the Pacific States as much as those residing in that section.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. Frzz PATRICK, it was not agreed to-yeas 15, nays 26-as fol

Green, Harlan, Houston, Tyerson, Johnson of Arkansas, Lane, Polk, Reid, Smith, and Ward—15.

NAYS—Messrs. Benjamin, Egler, Chandler, Clark, Clay, Collamer, Dixon, Toolittle, Burkee, Fessenden, Fitch, Foot, Foster, Humlin, Hunter, Johnson of Tennessee, King, Pearce, Rice, Schaetlan, Shields, Summons, Smart, Trumbull, Wilson, and Yulee—26.

Mr. WILSON moved to amend the amendment by pro

viding that the postage on letters shall be three cents for all distances within the United States not exceeding five hundred miles, and five cents for all distances over five hundred miles and less than three thousand miles which was not agreed to-yeas 16, nays 24—as follows:

YEAS—Mesers, Bigler, Cameron, Chandler, Clark, Collamer, Dixon, bodittle, Burkee, Fessenden, Foot, Foster, Hamlin, Harlan, Summons, rambull, and Witson—16.

NAYS—Mesers, Benjamin, Broderick, Brown, Clay, Clingman, avis, Fitch, Fizpatrick, Greon, Houston, Hunter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkanasa, Johnson of Tennessee, Lane, Folk, Reisl, Rec, Schasian, Shields, Smith, Stuart, Ward, and Yulce—24.

Mr. PEARCE moved to amend the amendment by adthorized shall be put in operation unless the Postmaste General shall be of opinion that the expense of the same can be defrayed out of the accruing revenues of the Post Office Department; which was not agreed to—yeas 3,

mays 35.

Mr. GWIN moved to amend the amendment by striking out the clause which states that "no other or further allowances whatever shall be made to any postmaster, except from the rents of boxes or pigeon-holes, as

agreed to—yeas 13, nays 22.
On motion by Mr. HALE, an amendment was adopted repealing the fourth section of the act of July 27, 1854, making provision for the postal service in the State of California, and the Territories of Oregon and Wash-

Mr. TRUMBULL moved to amend the amendment by etriking out that portion which retains the franking privilege for ex-Presidents and other persons to whom it has ed by name; which was not agreed to

been granted by name; which was not agreed to.

Mr. KING moved to amend the amendment by making
the rate of letter postage three cents for all distances between two post offices within the United States; which vas not agreed to—yeas 13, nays 21—as follows

YEAS—Messrs, Chandler, Clark, Collamor, Deolistic, Foot, Fester, Hale, Harlan, King, Shields, Simmons, Smith, and Wilson—13. NAYS—Messrs, Benjamin, Bigler, Broderick, Brown, Clay, Doughas, Fiels, Rwin, Houston, Hanter, Iverson, Johnson of Arkanes, John on of Tennessee, Lane, Mason, Reid, Schaatina, Shield, Toombs, Ward, Mr. HALE moved to amend the amendment so as

abolish the franking privilege allowed to the officials of the Post Office Department, and to postmasters through-out the country in reference to their official business; which was agreed to—yeas 18, nays 16.

The amendment of the committee, as amended, was

nen sdopted.

The bill was further amended by the addition of sur dry new routes; when it was read a third time.
The question being stated on its passage, no quorum

Several motions were made to adjourn, which were all voted down, as the democratic side of the house were anxious to pass the bill. After some conversation on the subject, with a general understanding that the vote should be taken to-morrow without debate, at half-past

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. BURNETT, of Kentucky, desired to ask permis-m to report a bill from the Committee on the District sion to report a bill from the Con of Columbia, and have it put upo Columbia, and have it put upon its passage.

Mr. JONES, of Tennessee, inquired whether a quorun

Tie SPEAKER (after a count) announced that there were only one hundred and thirteen members present; which belts less than a quorum— Mr. JONES woved that there be a call of the House;

hich motion did not prevail-yeas 27, nays 125 CONSULAR AND DIFFE-ZATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PHELPS, of Missouri, from the Committee of Ways said Means, reported back the amendments of the Senate to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill, and they were referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

THE POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL. The SPEAKER stated the business first in order to be

the consideration of the bill making appropriations for year ending June 30, 1860, reported yesterday from the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union with endments - the first question being on the mo tion of Mr. Pingaps, of Missouri, that the bill be res

Mr. PHELPS withdrew the motion to recommit; and question recurring upon the adoption of the am Mr. HUGHES, of Indiams, moved that the bill be laid table ; which motion was not agreed to-yeas 23,

nays 168 The question recurring upon the amendments, the first amendment, adding at the end of the paragraph appro-priating \$12,633,060 for the transportation of the inlan

ails, the following provise, was reported : Provided, however, That the contract with Butterfield & Co. fo

The question being taken, the amendment was reject ed-yeas 99, pays 102.

endment, adding, at the end of the line appropriating \$70,000 for advertising, a provise "that the advertisement of mail routes in each State and Territory shall be made only in the two newspapers in each Stat-and Territory having the largest circulation," was reyeas 91, nays 104.

jected.—yeas 91, nays 104.

The third amendment, providing, "further, that the
two newspapers aforesaid shall not be selected in the
same city or town, in any one State or Territory," was

fourth amendment, striking out the line "for The fourth amendment, striking out the line "tor blanks \$100,000," and inserting, "for blanks \$80,000, to be printed by the lowest responsible bidder, after advertisement inviting bids for the same shall have been published for at least thirty days by the Postmaster General," was agreed to—ayes 114, noes not counted. The fifth amendment, adding at the end of the line appropriating \$50,000 for wrapping paper, the proviso, "that the contract for the same shall be given to the lowest bidder." was agreed to.

'that the contract for the same shall be given to knowest bidder," was agreed to.

The sixth amendment, adding at the end of the line appropriating \$200,000 "for miscellaneous payments," he provise that the Postmaster General shall furnish to congress on the first Monday in December next, and the rst Monday in each year thereafter, a detailed statement of the expenditures under this head, and it shall not be oful to use any of the money hereby appropriated for defence of suits brought against officers of the Po office Deputment for malforsance, or acts committed by them under color of law, or in abrogation of the rights of citizens, was agreed to—ayes 104, noes not counted. The seventh amendment to the purgraph appropria-ting \$15,000 for publishing a new edition of the Post Of-

ice Laws and Regulations, and a List of Post Offices, pro-riding that the Postmaster General 'shall certify that aid new edition is efficient, and give the contract for its publication to the lowest responsible bidder." was agreed

The eighth amendment, adding at the end of the on appropriating \$3,838,728 to supply deficiencies in of the Post Office Depart nt, the proviso the revenue of the Post Office Department, the proviso "that the sums heretofore appropriated for the erection of post office buildings, which shall remain in the treasury unexpended at the close of the present fiscal year are hereby reappropriated for the objects to which they are now applicable by law, was agreed to—yeas 111,

The ninth and last amendment, adding the following Fig. 3. And be it further ensisted. That if the revenue of the Blice Department shall be insufficient to defray the appropria made in the first section of this act, the deficiency, if any ther it the expiration of each quarter of the fiscal year, shall be pair f any money in the treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The question being taken, the amendment was agreed

The question recurring upon the passage of the bill-Mr. HUGHES, of Indiana, moved that it be laid on the table; which motion was decided in the negative. Mr. PHELPS, of Missouri, then demanded the previous

mestion; which was sustained.

The question recurring on the passage of the bill—
Mr. COLFAX, of Indiana, stated that he had a very listinct recollection that the amendment offered yesterday by Mr. Aveny, of Tennessee, in relation to the overland nail, as amended by Mr. Gooch, of Massachusetts, had seen adopted, and the report in the Washington Union onfirmed that impression nestion; which was sustained.

onfirmed that impression.

Mr. FLORENCE, of Pennsylvania. It is not good au-The SPEAKER stated that all the amendments reported

the chairman of the committee had been acted upon Mr. COLFAX then read from the Union to surtain his

The SPEAKER replied that the amendment of Mr.

Goorn had been adopted, but it fell with the amendment of Mr. Avery, which had been rejected. The bill was then rejected—yeas 86, nays 119—as fol-

6.7. Mesers. Adrain, Ahl, Anderson, Atkins, Avery, Barksdale, Bishop, Bonham. Hench, Bleyon, Barns, Cockle, Clark of Medican, Both Cochrane of New York, Orning, Craig of Missouri, Clay John Cochrane of New York, Orning, Craig of Missouri, Boon, Exist of Indiana, Pavis of Missimpo, Baris of Iowa, Eddon, Baris of Iowa, Eddon, Barks, Barlikner, Foley, Gartrelt, Glimer, Goode, Green, Grege, Hall of Ohio, Hatch, Hawkins, Hodges, Hep, Horton, Hayler, Jackson, Jowett, Keitt, Kunkel of Mary, Lamar, Lunly, Lawrence, Maclay, McRae, Marshall of Maynard, Miller, Millson, Morris of Hinois, Mott, Pen, Petton, Phelpa of Missouri, Phelpa of Minneysta, Powell by, Roagam, Ruffin, Bussell, Sandidge, Savage, Soott, Shaw of A. Sickles, Singleton, Smith of Hinois, Smith of Pennesson, Steps, Stevenson, Stevart of Maryland, Taylor of Louisian, Validam Vaxce, Ward, Watkins, White, Whiteley, Windlow, Wood-Wortendyke, Wright of Georgia, wright of Tennessee, and coffer. 56

-Mesers, Abbott, Andrews, Bennett, Bingham, Blair, Bliss Grow, Hall of Mas-achoseus, Harlan, Haskin, Hekman, Hell, Hoard, Housen, Howard, Hughes, Jones of Tomosece, Jones of Fenneyl-Vania, Kein, Keisey, Kilgore, Knapp, Kunkel of Pennsylvania, Leach Leidy, Letcher, Lovejey, McQueen, Marshall of Kentucky, Mason, Matteson, Miles, Montgomery, Moore, Morgan, Morrill, Morris of Fennsylvania, Morse of Maine, Morae of New York, Marray, Olin, Palmer, Parker, Pettif, Philips, Pike, Potter, Pottle, Purtiance, Bleand, Ritchie, Robbins, Roberts, Royce, Scales, Seward, Slaw of North Carolina, Sherman of Olio, Sherman of New York, Skerter, Spinner, Stallworth, Stanton, Stawart of Pennsylvania, Talbot, Tappan, Thayer, Thompson, Pompkins, Frippe, Underwood, Wade, Walbridge, Waldrou, Waldon, Washburn of Maine, and Wilson—119.

Mr. PHELPS, of Missouri, moved that the rules be su nded and the House go into Committee of the Whole a the state of the Union; pending which —

on the state of the Union; pending which—
Mr. PLORENCE, of Pennsylvania, moved that the vote
by which the bill was passed be reconsidered, and the
motion to reconsider be laid on the lable.
Mr. PHELPS, of Missouri, contended that the motion
to lay on the table could not be made pending his motion
to suspend the rules.
The SPEAKER decided that the motion to lay on the

table could not be entertained at this time, but the tion to reconsider would be entered on the journal.

NAVAL ABUSES.

Mr. BOCOCK, of Virginia, by unanimous consent, from the select committee appointed to investigate naval con-tracts and naval abuses, submitted a report from the ma-jority, accompanied by the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the testimony taken in this investigation proves the

is declare that these abuses have been slowly but gradually growing picturing a long course of years, and that no particular administration should bear the entire blame therefor.

Resideo! That it is disclosed by the testimony in this case that the agency for the purchase of authracite coal for the use of the nay has been for some time past in the hands of a person wholly inefficient and grossly incompetent, and that reform is needed in the regulation which exist on that subject; but there is no proof which traces any knowledge of such inefficiently and incompetency to the responsibility authorities in Washington, nor any which shows that the need of reform grown especially out of any set of theirs; but, on the contrary it is expressly proven that the supply of coal for the naval service has been purchased during this administration upon terms relatively a favorable as ever herefore.

Headwell That while we could never sanction or approve any arrangement on the part of an officer of the government which, undepretence of making contracts for supplier, was designed to conference of making contracts for supplier, was designed to conference of making contracts for supplier, was designed to conference of making contracts for supplier, was designed to conference in the part of the own of the provention in September, 1858, between the Navy Department and W. C. N. ediff for the supply of live one to said department, it is clearly proven by the testimony that, if the secretary of the Navy did contemplate any favor to the aud signif, the did not design to bestow it to the detay of the give the good of the public and the interests of the contemplation of the government; but that in all he did in this matter he keptigent of the government; but that in all he did in this matter he keptigent of the government; but that in all he did in this matter he keptide and the interests of the contemplation.

for. Resolved, That in the letting of the contracts for the construction steam machinery for the vessels of the may, during the present sinistration, nothing has been shown which calls for the interport on of the Congress of the United States; but it is immires that resent head of the Navy Department has displayed a very hand all to assuig a the greatest amount of speed and efficiency attainer said vessels.

r said vessels.

Resolved, That neithing has been proven in this investigation which
peacehes in any way the personal or official integrity of the Secrery of the Navy.

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, from the same com submitted a minority report, accompanied by the following resolutions, offered as a substitute for the resolution reported by the majority:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy has, with the same

patronage in the pavy yard at Bricklyn among members of Congress, destroythes of discouling correction in its influence and bird

Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, also, from the same com-

rposes.

And then, on motion of Mr. BOCOCK, the further unideration of the reports was postponed till Monday

Mr. BOCOCK also submitted a motion that five thousand

extra copies of the report be printed; which motion referred to the Committee on Printing. THE NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

the House accordingly went into Committee of the hole on the state of the Union, (Mr. Joxes, of Tenne ce, in the Chair.)

Mr. PHELPS: of Missouri, then moved that the cou

The motion of Mr. PHELPS, of Missouri, being agree

mittee take up the bill making appropriations for the naval service for the year ending June 30, 1860; pending Mr. HUGHES, of Indiana, submitted a motion that the committee take up the bill which he had in his hand, (to revise the tariff of 1846.) He understood the committee had a right to originate a bill as well as te con-

sider those referred to them. He desired a vote upon

s proposition.

The CHAIRMAN decided that, under the rules of the House, the appropriation bills had precedence over all others; and the question being taken, the motion of Mr. Phelips was agreed to, and the navy appropriation bill taken up.

LIMITING GENERAL DEBATE.

On motion of Mr. PHELPS, the committee then rose when he submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That all debate in Committee of the Whole House on a tate of the Union on bill. No. 712 shall cease at 11 o'clock, a. m., norrow, and that in the mean time no vote shall be taken i i co-nitree of the Whole, except that the committee do rise or take a s-case, and in the House that it do adjourn.

Considerable time was occupied by dilatory motion that the House adjourn and the resolution be laid on the table, made by Mr. Sewann, of Georgia, and points of order mised by Mr. Huenes, of Indiana; when finally,

the resolution was adopted.

On motion of Mr. PHELPS, of Missouri, the Hoagain went into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, (Mr. Joxes, of Tennessee, in the chair,) and resumed the consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

BEVENUE AND EXPENDITURES.

Mr. MILLSON, of Virginia, replied to the remarks of Mr. Philars, of Fennsylvania, on the subject of revenue, and Mr. Garsett, of Virginia, on the expenditures of the government. He argued against specific duties and protection, and contended that these who clamored for protection, and contended that those who claimored for protection wished to increase the amount of taxes, to di-minish the revenue, and make up the deficiencies by double taxes upon other articles. He maintained that the tariff of 1857, if fairly tried, would produce suffi-cient revenue, and the failure to produce the necessary amount during the past year was attributable to embar-rassments in trade, not local, but extending through-out the world. He are not dust there had been a out the world. He argued that there had been a progressive and rapid increase both of imports and exports in the last ten years, both having more than exports in the last ten years, both having more than doubled, and there was no just reason to apprehend that they would not continue to increase. On the subject of expenditure he admitted that there had been an increase within the past ten years, and that, in many cases, this increase was proper and even inevitable. There were doubtless many expenses that ought to have been avoided, most of which had resulted from the votes of gentlemen opposed to the democratic members. It should be remembered that if our expenditures had increased, so had our revenue. This increase had resulted from two causes, the expansion of currency increased prices of causes, the expansion of currency increased prices of merchandise, and labor, and the multiplication of new merchandise, and labor, and the multiplication of new subjects of expenditures. Many new territorial govern-ments had been established; necessary public buildings had been erected here and elsewhere throughout the country; the army had been increased; men and ships had been added to the navy; the salaries of public offi-cers had been raised; the wages of labor had risen; and the same causes that had increased the expenditure also increased the revenue out of which the expenditure wa-to be paid. He showed that much of the expenditur-for the navy had risen from the addition of new ships, twenty-seven having been added in the last ten years. that the increase of appropriation for pay and subsistence of the navy had resulted necessarily from the increase of men, a thousand seamen having been added to the navy within two years; and that the increased appropriation for construction and equipment had risen from the substitution of steam ships for sailing vessels. He defended the appropriations made for the navy-yards, complained of the misapprehensions and mistakes of those who had assailed them, and showed that the amount ap-propriated by the present bill was nearly half a million less than the average expenditure of the last ten years.

ss than the average expenditure of the last ten years.

Mr. HOWARD, of Michigan, was not in favor of pro tection that would amount to a prohibition for any class, be they white or black. be the great principle which should govern their action that they were legislating for the Union—for the many and not for the few. He held that, instead of there being fifty-six millions of receipts for the next fiscal year the Secretary of the Treasury could by no possibility obtain forty-eight millions. We could import, when out of debt, as much as we export, but we owed five hundred millions, and it would take twenty-five millions of the exports to pay the interest on this debt every year. If we exported three hundred and hilly millions, and that was all they could do, unless there should be a general war in Europe, only three hundred and twenty five millions could be imported, because twenty-five millions would be taken to pay our debts. From this less than forty-five millions of dollars would be raised, and he thought the deficiency, instead of being eight millions of dollars, would be fifteen. He contended that protection was not to build up the manufacturer, but to develop resources. The price of an article was always governed by supply and demand, and if they shaped their policy so as to make their taxes as light as possible they must increase the supply. They could not do that by giving foreign monopoly the advanand, and tage over home productions. In every instance, since the organization of the government, where protection was properly applied, it had worked out a cheaper supply to the consumer than otherwise, and in every instance where a different result had been found, this principle had been wrongly applied. He expressed himself in favor of the tariff bill of Mr. Purnays, stating that, in bis

judgment, it had but one or two errors, and was far low protection.

Mr. CURRY, of Alabama, raid the Secretary of the Freasury had stated the expenditures of the last year to have been eighty-one and a half millions of dollars. larger amount than had ever been expended in one year before since the organization of this confederacy. The expenditures for the present year would not fall below that amount, and thus two questions of no ordinary im-port were presented: "Shall we increase our faxes?" for that was the word, however much they might attempt to disguise it; or, "Shall we diminish these expend tures?" He contended that the expenditures could i reduced, and that the reduction would supercede the necessity of increased taxation. He held that nations cessity of increased taxation. He held that national prosperity always increased under a low tariff, and then quoted the statistics of imports and exports to prove his assertion. He advocated ad valorem duties against specific, and thought that the question of twiff was the great overshadowing issue of the time, and that a protective tariff would be destructive to the interests of the South and of the democratic party. Ritherto the strength of the Union had been in the purity of their principles and their albergues to them. Were they take principles and their adherence to them. Were they to be hurled from the summit of their power by an indignant people as having betrayed their trust? Mr. NICHOLS, of Ohio, stated his position to be in

favor of free trade and direct taxation, and for hard mone and the restriction of the credit system. He contended that it was not the actual amount of duty levied, but the system of business in the country which brought about the commercial cmbarrassments. But he would tell them what he would do. He would vote for the suspension of the tariff last passed and the re-enactment of the tariff of 1846, with and the re-enactment of the tariff of 1846, with the understanding that the discrimination embraced in that tariff he had not favoived but repediated, and with the understanding that it afforded, if anything to be claimed for this theory of protection, all the protection any massonable interpret ought to demand. He then pro-ceeded to give the reasons why his voted for the passage of the Oregon bill. If the constitution of a State were republican in form, according to his judgment, he cared not for anything else, but would vote for its immediate admission.

Mr. KUNKEL, of Pennsylvania, advocated the impos tion of specific rather than all values duties, and remarked that he gave the President credit for his recommendation in its favor in his annual message, though he be-

lieved he had been obliged to do it. He then reviewed lieved he had been obliged to do it. He then reviewed the estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury, and the imports and exports, contending that forty-two millions of dollars was all the revenue that could be raised, and it being insufficient to meet the expenditures of the government, the country must run in debt. Instead of protective tariffs being obsolefe, they were the best revenue measures. No mistake could be greater than that which looked to a reduction of duty to raise the revenue. All experience was against it. The first tariff enacted in this country in 1789 contained in its preamble the true principles of every tariff, declaring it to be to pay the expenses of the government, the debt of the government, and to encourage the inclustry of the country. A little reflection on the whole subject would convince any man that the tariff that best protects industry is the best for lection on the whole subject would convince any man hat the tariff that best protects industry is the best for

Mr. VALLANDIGHAM, of Ohio, contended that it they would but just divest themselves in making tariffs of the idea that they were anything else than taxes, and call things by their right names, there would be less trouble to the country upon this vexed question. It was the mistake that was made upon the subject which had led to the difficulties, controversies, and frequent changes which had marked their progress from the beginning of the government in relation to taxes. It was true if the government in relation to taxes. It was true, it was maintained that it was the duty of the government under the constitution to regard only the revenue standard in fixing the rate, but that was not now observed it principle. Why were not coffee and tea taxed? Neither was produced in the United States, and the consumption and importation were great. They were not taxed and importation were great. They were not taxed because they were regarded as among the necessaries of life and the burden would fall upon millions little able to bear it. He was not a friend of the tariff of 1857, which he regarded as poculiarly a manufacturer's tariff, and a high protective one at that, sacrificing the interests of the producer and especially of the agricultural portion of the country. If there was to be a revision of the tariff now, he demanded in adjusting it they would have regard to the true principles of taxation—the interests of all concerned. In making the tariff of 1857, linesed and wool, very important interests in his State, had been disregarded, and in addressing the committee this evening, he should advocate their recognition; and if the tariff were to be revised, should give notice of or two amendments, which he desired to offe

PARTY POLITICS.

Mr. THAYER, of Massachusetts, contended that the was great confusion in the democratic ranks—and then proceeded to define the principles of the republican par-y, which he held were highly national. He argued that was in favor of popular sovereignty, was the party ring it in possession, and when that was consistent aving it in possess with its principles, it was perfectly safe for the cause of

[On motion of Mr. SEWARD, of Georgia, debate was hereafter restricted to thirty minutes.]

INDIAN OUTRAGES.

Mr. BEAGAN, of Texas, advocated the passage of the bill to refund to the State of Texas the amount she has expended in protecting the frontier from the attacks of Indians, when the government had not the power to afford her the safety to which she was entitled as one of the States of the Union. There was an absolute necessi-ty for the enlistment of these troops, and he would not detain the committee by going through the testimony to detain the committee by going through the testimony to show the number of persons who had been killed, or the various outrages which had been committed.

Mr. BLISS, of Ohio, said he was opposed to some the provisions of the tariff of 1857, and in favor of a modification of some of its provisions. He would raise the revenue so as to affect the interests of all parts of the country in a uniform manner. There was a radical dif-ference in principle between a tariff for protection and a tariff for revenue. The former was unconstitutional, whilst the latter was not. He was opposed to increasing the present revenue, which he regarded as abundant for

d economical purposes. In conclusion, he expresses inself in favor of specific duties. Mr. BOYCE, of South Carolina, adverted to the over flowing condition of the treasury at the time the tariff of 1857 passed, and said, in his opinion, its object had been accomplished in producing about fifty millions of dollars. This year it had fallen off, owing to the peculiarly embarrassed condition of the business affairs of the country. He had no doubt, in ordinary times, the existing tariff would produce the estimated amount, and the question was, would that be enough? It was very clear that they must would that be enough? It was very clear that they must cither increase the revenue or diminish the expenditures. He chose the latter, and proceeded to point out various expenditures that might be lessened without detriment to the public service; and, in this connexion, urged the making of the Post Office Department self-sustaining. If they could not accomplish this, then they should abolish it. He was opposed to a revision of the tariff, and thought the true policy was to reduce the expenses of the govern-

Mr. GRANGER, of New York, urged such a revision of the tariff as would raise revenue enough to support the government, and, at the same time, produce all the pro-

THE SLAVE TRADE

Mr. SEWARD, of Georgia, addressed the ec air. SEWARD, of Georgia, addressed the committee upon the subject of the repeal of the laws prohibiting the African slave trade, arguing that the act of 1820, which declared slavery to be piracy, was in violation of the con-stitution of the United States. THE PACIFIC RAILROAD. Mr. CURTIS, of Iowa, addressed the committee

he subject of a Pacific railroad, remarking that the selec committee appointed by the House to consider that sub jeet, had instructed him to report a bill for the construc-tion of a road on the central route. The bill did not purpose that the work should be made by the government, but by a company, or by individuals, and for the purpose inducing bidders to take the matter into consideratic it was proposed that they should receive donations land, starting with the usual amount of six miles in width, that amount increasing at both ends until it width, that amount increasing at both ends until it meets the centre of the line; and in addition to that shall receive compensation in money for each mile pro-gressed. The total amount of money to be granted would be twenty-five millions of dollars. Supposing the read to be twenty-five nattions of dollars. Supposing the read to be two thousand miles long, and the total amount of land would be 12,800,000 acres. He then proceeded to arone that the to argue that the construction of the road wa tional, on the ground that it was needed for the mili-tary defence of the country.

Mr. LEIDY, of Pennsylvania, addressed the commit tee upon the subject of a tariff, arguing in favor of a tariff producing revenue sufficient to meet the expense of the government, with incidental protection. He con-tended that this policy was constitutional.

The committee then rose, and the House adjourned.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED

Turnspay Franciany 24 1859 No. 70. The Board of Commissioners of the County of in error, vz. Wm. H. Aspinwall et al. Knox, plaintiffs in error, v. Wm. H. Aspinwall et al. Th argument of this cause was continued by Mr. Vinto for the defendants in error, and concluded by Mr. Rev

rdy Johnson for the plaintiffs in error.

Adjourned until to morrow, 11 o'clock

COURT OF CLAIMS.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 1859. James McCormick in. The United States. Judge Blackand delivered the opinion of the Court in this case ad-erse to the claim.

Ephraim F. Gilbert vs. The United States. Mr. Tyson

esumed and concluded his opening argument in this are for the claimant. Mr. Gillet, United States Solici

tor, replied in behalf of the government; when the Court adjourned to 12 o'clock, Monday next. RABLEGARS IN TEXAS.—At the present time there are in Texas 183 miles of railroad open, 113 graded, and 41 under contract. During the last six months 42 miles have been open, 11 graded, and 31½ under contract. There are now at Houston, and shortly to arrive there,

9,500 tons of iron, being the amount required to iron 95 miles of road, and making the construction of that

CATHOLICISM IN THE UNITED STATES.—The Metropolita Catholic Almanas for 1859, states that in 1808 there were in the United States' 2 bishops, 64 priests, and 80 churches, i. e., church edifices. Ten years later there were 10 bishops, 232 priests, and 230 churches. 'At the Toke of the next decade there were 17 bishops, 432 priests, 907 churches. At the present time there are 45 bishops, 2,108 priests, and 2,324 churches. 'The constitution of the characteristics of the characteristics of the constitution of the constitution of the characteristics of the characteristics of the characteristics. pilers of the almanac refrain from estimating the Catho-lic population of the United States, on account of the an estimate of 800 members to each church would give 1,867,200 as the Catholic population of the United

WASHINGTON CITY.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1869.

THE TARIFF OF 1846.

It has become perfectly obvious that no measur of revenue can be adopted by the present Congress, in the short space of time now remaining of its legal existence, except the simple suspension of the tariff of 1857 for a period of some three years-a period sufficient to allow full time for the commerce of the country to thoroughly reinstate itself from the convulsion of 1857. The effect of such a suspension would be to revive and put in force the act of 1846, a measure which was framed by the democratic party, and espoused by that party in its platform, which carried it through the war with Mexico, the war with the fusion in 1852, the war with the know-nothings in 1854-'5, the war with the blackrepublicans in 1856, and which would have carried it bravely and successfully through the term of Mr. Buchanan and the campaign of 1860, but for the unfortunate passage of the act of 1857 in the closing session c, the last administration. Defects that measure may have, and modifications there may be which would be in the highest degree advisable in it, if time permitted them to be made; but it at least had this merit, that it was an efficient tariff for revenue, and that from 1846 to 1857 it enjoyed the character of a democratic tariff, commanded the sanc tion of the democratic party, and was identified with the proudest era, with the grandest development, in our national history. What was democratic for ten years previously to 4857 would certainly not be anti-democratic after that period; what was so intimately identified with the glory and expansion of our country then, would certainly not prove ominous of decline and decay now. It seems to us that here is a safe and fair compro

mise ground for all the members of our party, or of any party in Congress who were dem ocrats from 1846 to 1857, and over whose views on leading democratic questions no acknowledged change has come. Certain it is that the measure of 1846 commanded the unqualified approval of every man who belonged to the democratic party in the period when it was in force; and whether these men still remain within the true fold, or have wandered off into strange pastures, we think it would be difficult for them to reconcile a rejection of the proposition to compromise on the tariff of 1846 now with their votes and their arguments in behalt of the neasure in the past. Is it southern men who would be obstinate on this proposition? Let them explain how it was that the South supported with unanimity this measure for ten years-a measure framed expressly for revenue-a measure effective for reveme : and how it is that she now can contend obsti nately for the substitute of 1857—a measure framed avowedly to defeat revenue-a measure notorious ly associated with the exclusive interests of the New England manufacturers.

If it be the northern democrats who are obstinate on this proposition, how was at that the entire denocracy of the North rallied so enthusiastically to the act of 1846, while it was in operation, and carried the elections in 1852 by a majority unprecedented in the history of the democracy of the North ?-nay, how is it that in spite of the then untoward and em barrassing attitude of the slavery question, they car ried the elections in 1856 with this tariff of 1846 emblazoned on their shield? Surely what was ac centable-what was so agreeable to the democracy of the North then, cannot be very injurious or repulsive to them now.

Is it those members who, once members of the lemocratic party, have gone off after strange gods in recent years, that would now obstinately oppose the acceptance of a measure which once had their full approval as to principle and their support as a prac tical political issue? By opposing it now, they tacitly confess that their present object is one of mere partisan and reckless opposition to the party who are responsible for the administration of the

In no aspect in which the proposition can be viewed do we find insurmountable objections to the acceptance of it by those members of Congress who are superior to the arts of mere parti san machination. Two measures are absolutely ne cessary to the carrying on of the government. The first and most important is that of authorizing the reissuing in some form of the treasury notes which are now coming in in lieu of the revenue customs The other measure is, the adoption of some measure unlike t'e tariff of 1857, which operates to defeat revenue, but which shall operate to produce it in sufficient quantity to meet the appropriations voted by Congress. Those who refuse to vote for these two measures vote, virtually, to stop the wheels of government; and if the present Congress shall adjourn without providing the ways and means for administrating the government according to the requirements of the laws passed by themselves, it will make itself notorious in all our subsequent national history, as a Congress which knew its duty and proved dereliet to it.

THE SLAVERY DEBATE IN THE SENATE. A mischievous boy has but to throw a chip into the pond and all the Newfoundland dogs on the common will instantly take water in pursuit of it. Mr. Hale

the Merryman of the Senate, has pitched in the chip, and all the high bloods of that august body have rushed into the water in full chase. The unfortunate and unprofitable subject of slavery in Kanas, has occupied two whole days in the Senate, at a time which is worth more to the dispatch of business than two weeks or two months would be at any

other period. We regret this debate far more on personal grounds than on public. We were anxious that we should not have to repeat our views on this subject, in reply to the doctrines and arguments used by Judge Douglas last summer in the Illinois canvass. As the subject has come up again, bowever, we shall repeat our views and then let the matter drop again, we would fain trust, forever.

We supposed, since the repeated action of Congress, and especially since the decision of the Sh reme Court of the United States in the Dred Scott se, it had become the settled law of the country, that the federal legislature could not prohibit slaery in the Territories. It has been so understood by the country, and is certainly one of the fundamental articles of the democratic creed.

During the necessities of his canvass in Illinois, Mr. Douglas in his Freeport speech announced that

regulations, exclude slavery from the Territories If it were his object to say only that a territorial legislature might wrongfully adopt a great many malicious measures injurious to slave and all other property, it would be a proposition not worthy of notice or comment. But this is not the purpose of that senator. He intends to go still further, and affirm what he asserts in argument, that, by the exercise of the taxing power, and the withholding of all remedica for the recovery or holding of slave property, a territorial government may legally and constitutionally exclude it. That is, while he denies to Congress the power to adopt the Wilmot proviso, he maintains that Congress may create an inferior agency, a territorial council, with more power than Congress, and that the creature may constitutionally exercise a power inhibited to the creator by that compact. In other words, that Congress may confer on another more legislative power than it possesses of itself. Such proposition needs only to be stated. Its absurdity is too manifest for argument. It is fully met by the decision of the Dred Scott case. That decision declares that the Territories are a common fund, open to all the citizens of the United States to take their property there, slaves as well as all other. It denies the power of Congress, or a territorial legislature, to exclude slaves or other property. Speaking of these powers and others, the court say: "It is a total absence of power anywhere within the dominion of the United States, and places the citizens of a Territory, so far as these rights are concerned, on the same footing with citizens of the S-ates, and guards them as firmly and plainly against any inroads which the general government might attempt under the plea of implied or incidental powers. And if Congress itself cannot do this; if it is beyond the powers confered on the federal government, it will be admitted, we presume, that it could not authorize a territorial government to exercise them. It could confer no power on any local government, established by its authority, to violate the provisions of the con-

The principle of the decision is accurately stated in the syllabus of the case, thus: "Every citizen has a right to take with him into the Territory every article of property which the constitution of the United States recognises as property. The constitution of the United States recognises slaves as property, and pledges the federal government to protect it; and Congress cannot exercise any more authority over property of that description than it may constitutionally exercise over property of any other kind." The case goes still further, and declares that neither Congress nor a territorial legislature possesses any power to destroy private property, or even take it for public use, without making just ompensation.

If a territorial legislature cannot destroy slave property by direct legislation, or exclude it from the mmon territory, any enactments framed with that object would be equally unconstitutional, and proounced void by the judicial department of the gov-

rument. The constitutional law of Mr. Douglas is bad, and the spirit with which he invites the territorial authorities to exclude slave property still worse, as in direct conflict with the decision of the Supreme Court, and grossly unjust to the whole South and all its citizens. Of what practical import is it to the South whether the Wilmot proviso is applied by Congress itself or a territorial agency crea-

ted by the federal legislature?

Mr. Douglas argues that there can be no remedy for the recovery of a slave in a Territory repless one is furnished by its legislature, and some extreme southern men appear anxious to fasten upon this idea as affording ground for further legislation, and fresh food for agitation. As a legal proposition, it is a manifest fallacy. The constitution gives the right to hold slaves in a Territory. Then, there is as much law to recover a slave as a horse, and, it is even less in the power of the legislature to destroy the propcrty by taking away the remedy. If the constitution guarantied property in horses, what lawyer would say that an act of the legislature prohibiting the courts from entertaining actions for the recovery of that species of property could be sustained as constitutional? The right being admitted, the court would apply the remedy. According to tled rules, the people who carry the property and the right would take the ordinary remedies incident

to the right as part of the law : "If an uninhabited country is discovered and planted by British subjects, the English laws are said to be im-mediately in force there; for the law is the birth right of every subject; so that wherever they go they cary their laws with them; and the new-found country is governed by them."—1 Story Const., 132, 1 Bl. Com., 107. " If an uninhabited country is discovered and planted

All well informed jurists admit the existence of a ontmon law in the colonies in relation to slavery Mr. Hurd at page 206, of his able book, Law of Freedom and Bondage, says: "It was judicially regarded as resting on natural reason indicated in the law of nations historically known at that period, the common law of the world, applied in international and municipal law, because indicating the will of the supreme source of law having the territorial jurisdic tion, whenever not disallowed by some more direct exposition of that will."

In Siville vs. Chritien, 5 Martin, p. 275, the supreme court of Louisiana, say : "It is an admitted principle that slavery has been permitted and tolerated in all the colonies established in America by the mother country. Not only of Africans, but of Indians. No legislative act of the colonies can be found in relation to it."

The slave is treated as personal property. A property, he is considered as a chattel; and the courts being organized, in absence of any further statutory enactment, the ordinary remedies of trover, trespass, and detinue must exist in all the Territories for the recovery of the slave. It is simply absurd to suppose that these remedies could be taken away. unless something in their nature was substituted. It is not in the power of legislation to destroy property by denying all remedy. This was held in the early

case of Fletcher vs. Peck. In all that portion of country acquired from France the civil law remedies, which are ample as they existed in Louisiana at the time of the purchase from France, and at the date of the admission of Louisi ana and Missouri stift exist. The Nebraska act repealed the Missouri restriction, and the Dred Scott case pronounces that it never had any legal existence. It does not, therefore, admit of doubt that the civil law remedica are still in force in that val region of country.

Under the treaty of 1803 slave property could not a territorial legislature might, by unfriendly police be excluded from that region so long as the country